

REMARKS

Claims Objections

Claims 19 and 20 have been amended to address the informalities noted by the examiner.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112

The undersigned representative cannot find any instances of “the routers” in line 2 of claim 1. Therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-15 and 18-20 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,526,056 (Rekhter et al.) is respectfully traversed

The passage cited by the examiner at col. 27, lines 38-59 relates to importing of addresses supplied by a customer edge (CE) router to a provider edge (PE) router. The PE may remove unauthorized “Community Attributes” or adds Community Attributes, before the PE router exports them to another PE. A route carrying a Community Attribute value cannot be advertised outside the VPN. See col. 23, lines 41-46. Contrary to the assertion of the examiner, there appears to be no mention of the inclusion of route distinguishers or route targets in the routes. Furthermore, contrary to the assertion of the examiner, there is no mention in lines 60-67 of col. 27 of an acceptance during importation of only a subset of the routes according target policy. This passage mentions only distribution of addresses from the PE router to a CE router, and using outbound filtering to prevent distribution of certain addresses to the CE router.

The examiner identifies “CE2” as a re-export filter and cites a passage in Rekhter et al., beginning at line 65, in column 32 and continuing to line 11 in column 33, as disclosing a re-export filter modifying the next hop information in a second subset of routes, and distributing the routes. This passage states:

“When a packet addressed to D arrives at PE3 from CE3, the packet is identified, again possibly by virtue of its incoming interface, as coming

from VPN B. PE3 looks in its per-VPN FIB for VPN B and sees that the next hop is PE2. The packet then gets sent to PE2, which sends it on to CE2. CE2 runs the packet through the firewall, and CE2 attempts to forward the packet if the firewall does not reject it. Since the destination is not on-site, the packet gets sent to PE2. PE2 looks up D in its per-VPN FIB for VPN A, and sees that PE1 is the next hop. The packet is then sent to PE1.”

However, there is no mention of a re-export filter in the passage, must less one at CE2. CE2 is a customer edge router. See, e.g., col. 6, lines 36-37 and col. 3, line 1. Indeed, this passage is describing only forwarding of packets, not distribution of routes. There is no mention of modifying next hop information in a subset of routes and then distributing it. The passage appears to be describing only look up of the next hop in a forwarding information base (FIB) -- i.e. looking up a route. It sees that PE1 is the next hop, and then forwards the packet to PE1.

Given the complete absence from Rekhter et al. of several limitations required by the independent claims, Rekhter cannot anticipate any of the claims. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-15 and 18-20 is in error for at least these reasons.

In light of the substantial nature of the noted errors, applicants have elected not to address at this time any remaining errors in the examiner’s reasoning of the rejections of the independent claims, or the errors in the reasoning made in the rejection of the dependent claims. It reserves the right to address these errors at a later time. Any failure to specifically address any reasoning should not be construed as acquiescence or waiver.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Given that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of dependent claims 4, 10 and 16 is premised on this same faulty reading of Rekhter et al., this rejection is also in error for at least the same reasons noted above. The right to address the errors in the application of Lin and its combination with Rekhter et al. is respectfully reserved.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in allowable form. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants hereby authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees, other than issue fees, that may be required by this paper to Deposit Account No. 07-0153. The Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicants' Attorney for any reasons that would advance the current application to issue. Please reference Attorney Docket No. 131105.1003.

Respectfully submitted,
GARDERE WYNNE SEWELL LLP

/Marc A. Hubbard /
Marc A. Hubbard
Registration No. 32,506

Dated: January 8, 2008

3000 Thanksgiving Tower
1601 Elm Street
Dallas, Texas 75201-4761
(214) 999-4880 - Telephone
(214) 999-3880 - Facsimile